2005 PEA

For the initial technical report in December 2005, only uranium intercepts that had an average grade of 0.05 % U_3O_8 or greater and were of sufficient thickness to yield a GT product of 0.50 were used. RBS&A calculated separate inferred uranium resources for the Dewey and Burdock areas as shown below:

2005 Inferred Resources

	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U_3O_8)
Dewey Area	887,000	0.22 % U_3O_8	4.0 million
Burdock Area	920,000	0.20 % U_3O_8	3.6 million
Total Dewey-Burdock	**1,807,000**	**0.21 % U_3O_8**	**7.6 million**

2008 and 2008

In 2007 and 2008, Powertech conducted confirmatory exploration drilling, including 155 holes. In addition, Powertech installed water wells for water quality testing and for aquifer testing. This work confirmed and replicated the historic drill data and provided some in-fill definition of uranium roll-fronts.

2009 PEA

An updated technical report, describing Powertech's 2007 and 2008 activities and revising its resource base was published in June 2009. That updated report increased the total resources within the Dewey-Burdock Project upward to 10.8 million pounds of inferred uranium resources, contained in 2,992,836 tons averaging 0.182 % U_3O_8. These resources were based on a 0.20 GT cut-off.

In the updated technical report of June 2009, uranium intercepts with an average grade of 0.02 % U_3O_8 or greater and a GT value of 0.20 were used in the calculation of inferred resources. The inclusion of these 0.20 GT cut-off resources with the previously-identified resources from the original technical report, had the effect of reducing the average grade of the Dewey-Burdock total resource inventory.

2009 Inferred Resources

	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U_3O_8)
Dewey Area	1,198,136	0.195 % U_3O_8	4,659,400
Burdock Area	1,794,700	0.172 % U_3O_8	6,153,600
Total Dewey-Burdock	**2,992,836**	**0.182 % U_3O_8**	**10,813,000**

2010 PEA

2.3 Sources of Information and Data
All of the revised detailed and factual data were obtained directly from the staff of Powertech (USA), Inc. This data included drill hole data, electric logs, drill hole maps, mineralized drill hole databases, GT contour maps and resource calculation databases.

In the updated 2010 technical report, using the above-described evaluation criteria, project resources were calculated and reported for both Inferred Resources and Indicated Resource

categories. The author did not believe there were sufficient drill hole records or density to support the calculation of Measured Resources. In addition, project resources are being reported for both a 0.20 GT and a 0.50 GT cut-off.

2010 Dewey-Burdock Resources – 0.20 GT

	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U_3O_8)
Indicated Resources	1,561,560	0.214 % U_3O_8	6,684,285
Inferred Resources	1,597,957	0.153 % U_3O_8	4,884,536
Total Dewey-Burdock	**3,251,653**	**0.178 % U_3O_8**	**11,568,821**

2010 Dewey-Burdock Resources – 0.50 GT

	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U_3O_8)
Indicated Resources	1,561,560	0.214 % U_3O_8	6,684,285
Inferred Resources	1,259,438	0.179 % U_3O_8	4,525,500
Total Dewey-Burdock	**2,820,998**	**0.198 % U_3O_8**	**11,209,785**

Table ES.1: 2010 Dewey-Burdock Resources – 0.50 GT Cut-off (Bush 2010)

Classification	Tons	Average Grade	Pounds (U_3O_8)
Indicated Resources	1,561,560	0.214 % U_3O_8	6,684,285
Inferred Resources	1,259,438	0.179 % U_3O_8	4,525,500

2015 PEA

The purpose of this PEA is to audit the mineral resource estimate and update the capital and operating cost estimates and economic analysis with the most recent market information and to account for a revised construction and operations ramp up schedule

Table 1.1: Updated Resources from Previous PEA (Effective date-January 29, 2015)

	Previous PEA[1]	Grade	Current PEA[2]	Grade	% Change Pounds
Estimated Measured Resource (lb)	0	NA	4,122,000	0.330%	
Estimated Indicated Resource (lb)	6,684,000	0.214%	4,460,000	0.210%	
Estimated M&I Resource (lb)	6,684,000	0.214%	8,582,000	0.250%	28%
Estimated Inferred Resource (lb)	4,526,000	0.179%	3,528,000	0.050%	-22%

Table 1.2: 2015 Mineral Resource Estimate Summary (Effective date-January 29, 2015)

	Estimated Measured Resources	Estimated Indicated Resources	Estimated M& I Resources	Estimated Inferred Resources
Pounds	4,122,000	4,460,000	8,582,000	3,528,000
Tons	554,000	992,000	1,546,000	586,000
Avg. GT	1.30	1.28	1.29	0.20
Avg. Grade (% U_3O_8)	0.33%	0.21%	0.25%	0.05%
Avg. Thickness (Feet)	3.9	6.0	5.2	4.2

2018 PEA
Prepared in accordance with the guidelines set forth under National Instrument (NI) 43-101 and NI 43-101F1 for the submission of technical reports on mining properties.

Subsequent to the 2015 PEA resource calculation, Azarga has added additional mineralized intercepts and redefined the cutoff grade for resource estimation based on uranium recovery from production operations using ISR methods. Azarga is now following industry standard using the redefined cutoff of GT ≥ 0.20 rather than the previously used GT ≥ 0.50.

Commented [RV1]: Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

In the 2015 PEA, the resource estimate used a 0.050% cutoff. However, in this Resource Estimate a 0.020% cutoff was used as this cutoff is typical of ISR industry practice and represents appropriate values relative to current ISR operations. Experience at other ISR operations has demonstrated that grades below 0.020% can technologically be successfully leached and recovered, given supporting economics. Due to the nature of roll front deposits and production well designs, the incremental cost of addressing low grades is minimal (given the presence of higher grades). Note, however, that the above cutoffs were selected without direct relation to any associated commodity price.

Resource estimation also used a 0.20 GT cut-off for all drilling.

In summary, minerals reportable as resources must meet the following cut-off criteria (see also Section 14.4):
Minimum Grade: 0.020% eU_3O_8
Grade measured below this cut-off is considered as zero value.
Minimum GT (Grade x Thickness): 0.20 GT
Intercepts with GT values below this cut-off are mapped exterior to the GT contours employed for resource estimation, given zero resource value and therefore are excluded from reported resources.
Minimum Thickness: No minimum thickness is applied, but is inherent within the definition of GT (Grade Thickness).

Employing these considerations, mineralization which meets the above criteria is classified as a resource and assigned a level of confidence via the following drill spacing guidelines: